DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 227 IR 054 715

AUTHOR Grimes, Deborah J.
TITLE The Library-Classroom Link: History, Theory, and Application.
PUB DATE 28 Jul 93
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Cooperative Ventures Conference of the Combined Media Organizations of Georgia (2nd, Jekyll Island, GA, March 9, 1990). Revised July 1993.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; Curriculum Development; *Educational Cooperation; Educational History; Educational Theories; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; Librarians; Library Cooperation; *Library Instruction; Library Role; Library Services; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Historical Background; *Librarian Teacher Cooperation

ABSTRACT

The link between classrooms and the library is emphasized, and cooperation between librarians and instructors in developing library instructional programs is advocated. A context for academic library instruction is developed by examining its history. The philosophical rationale for library instruction is generally traced to the lectures of Ralph Waldo Emerson in the 1840s. The concepts of librarian as educator and educator as librarian developed in parallel in American educational history, with increasing demands on the librarian for instruction as the complexity of information resources has increased. The term "bibliographic instruction" had come into common parlance by the 1970s, and job descriptions and announcements began to refer to such instruction. In the current age of technological advancement, instruction is recognized as a library essential. What is actually taught is examined, with a look at the theoretical basis of library instruction. Looking at current trends in library instruction makes it clear that any approach to instruction is by necessity embedded in the subject field. Library instruction is inextricably linked to the classroom. Ways in which librarians can strengthen this link are discussed. Librarians must convince the teaching faculty that they are also serious educators, and to this goal they must increase their instructional skills. (Contains 24 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 364 227

THE LIBRARY-CLASSROOM LINK: HISTORY, THEORY, AND APPLICATION

Deborah J. Grimes
1990 COMO Conference: Cooperative Ventures II

March 9, 1990
Jeckyll Island, Georgia

Revised July 1993

INTRODUCTION

I must congratulate you on the cooperative approach the Georgia professional organizations have taken toward developing a conference for library and media professionals. The theme of "cooperative ventures" is also the one that I have taken for my presentation this afternoon. The purpose of this presentation is to emphasize the library-classroom link and to advocate cooperation between librarians and instructors in developing library instructional programs that are meaningful to students.

In order to do that, I must first do two things: offer historical and theoretical contexts within which to view library (or bibliographic) instruction and then provide an overview of current trends in library instruction. To conclude, I will offer examples of ways in which cooperation between librarians and instructors can strengthen the link between the classroom and the academic library.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

A context for academic library instruction can be developed by examining its history, and, when we do that, we find that the

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Deborah J. Grimes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

philosophical rationale for library instruction is generally attributed to the lectures of Ralph Waldo Emerson in the 1840s. In these lectures, Emerson proposed that a 'professor of books' is desperately needed to support a "kind of 'great books' program through which students [will] be liberally educated" (Tucker 10).

The "educational revolution" of the 1860s and 1870s, launched by the Morrill Federal Land Grant Act of 1862 (which established public colleges in the United States) and by the adoption of the German university model (with its emphasis on "scientific research and systematic scholarship"), provided the necessary environment in which to adopt Emerson's approach (Hopkins 193). In fact, these very changes brought with them the concept of librarian as educator (Tucker 11).

On the other hand, we may also view this development as the educator as librarian. At this time in American educational history, librarians were generally faculty scholars with the dual responsibilities of providing library resources and teaching. Frances Hopkins reflects that these scholars had a "natural inclination in [the] academic setting to teach the use of the library for academic purposes" (Hopkins 193). In particular, she cites Justin Winsor of Harvard, Azariah Root of Oberlin, and Edwin Woodruff of Cornell as examples of the scholar-librarian of the late 1800s who taught, in addition to their subject interests, bibliography, library organization, and history of the book (193-194). Their approach was generally to emphasize research strategies rather than simple access procedures, giving

attention to the 'methods by which a subject is attacked' (Winsor qtd. in Hopkins 193).

Unfortunately, the increase in libraries and library collection sizes that accompanied the growth of higher education in the late 1800s also caused a shortage of "trained" librarians, who generally learned their profession through one-to-one apprenticeships after earning college degrees (Hopkins 194). To remedy this situation, Melvil Dewey established the School of Library Economy at Columbia in 1877, recruiting for the first time women and basing the curriculum entirely on the practical aspects of librarianship. The only entrance requirements were "native ability" and "good character" (Hopkins 194). These two situations resulted in the simplification of library instruction to access procedures--too few librarians were available to provide instruction and those who were available were educated in practical procedures rather than in subject matter or scholarship (Hopkins 194).

By the 1920s and 1930s, undergraduates were found to be ill-prepared for collegiate work in general and poorly prepared for individual study requiring fundamental library skills (Tucker 14). Ever responsive, librarians and educators were not content to allow the situation to continue. The "library-college movement" began with the idea that "teaching librarians [would] team with subject specialist professors to guide undergraduates in independent, interdisciplinary study" (Hopkins 194). This approach was designed to move the student "out of the classroom

and into the library, where the student conduct[ed] independent studies under the direction of bibliographically skilled, subject-oriented faculty members" (Tucker 21). The library-college movement was supported by, among others, Louis Shores and B. Lamar Johnson (Tucker 16). Later librarians respect the movement for "its comprehensive approach to higher education, its emphasis on independent study, and its view of the totality of learning materials as the 'generic book' to which all students should be introduced" (Tucker 21). The liberal arts environments in which these experiments were embedded, however, floundered, and the library-college movement never flourished (Hopkins 194).

After World War II, American higher education experienced another boom, culminating in the 1960s in phenomenal growth and fundamental changes. This was a period of re-democratization of higher education, bringing diverse and often poorly prepared students to colleges in overwhelming numbers. It was a period during which "rigid syllabi and assigned paper topics gave way to more independent study as faculties accommodated to student rebelliousness" (Hopkins 195).

As a result of the "social forces" of the 1960s and the boom in higher education, librarians were forced to reconsider their approaches to library instruction and student needs (Hopkins 195). One result of the increasing demands on librarians for instruction is reflected in the entrenchment of the reference desk as the primary means, at the time, of providing assistance to students. It also reflects what Tucker calls the "conceptual

ambiguities" of the library profession regarding its role in the educational process (Tucker 19). He find three dominant roles for academic librarians in the literature: instructional (where the purpose of the librarian is to teach the user to teach him/herself); informational (where the purpose of the librarian is to retrieve information); and situational (where the librarian must exercise professional judgment to find a balance between the informational and instructional roles) (Tucker 20). In fact, Frances Hopkins hypothesizes that "the reference desk, offering ad hoc information services, displaced [library instruction] . . . decisively as the focus and ideal of academic library service" (Hopkins 196). Nevertheless, the "social forces" of the 1960s revived bibliographic instruction, and the beginning of a real bibliographic instruction movement was evident (Hopkins 195).

With plentiful federal funding, a number of small, experimental colleges were established that focused on "integrative, humanistic education" for undergraduates (Hopkins 195). One of the best known of these was established at Monteith College of Wayne State University, where Patricia Knapp devised a program based on the belief that "library competence is a liberal art that is systematically ignored by subject specialists [i.e., teaching faculty] intent on imparting content rather then competence in learning" (Hopkins 195-196). Using a problem-solving approach to library instruction, the Monteith College Library Experiment (as it came to be known) reflects the beginning of an "upsurge" in bibliographic instruction

(Fjallbrandt and Malley 173; for further discussion of the Monteith College Library Experiment, see Knapp).

This upsurge is better characterized as a "grass-roots effort," where librarians once again saw a need and used "whatever resources were at hand" to provide bibliographic instruction (Tucker 21). Brievik points out that, unlike the unsuccessful library-college movement of the 1940s that grew from the "top down (first theory, then application)," the current bibliographic instruction movement is growing from the "bottom up (beginning with on-the-job techniques)" (Brievik 24-25).

By the 1970s, the term "bibliographic instruction" had come into common parlance and its practice became a routine function of academic library reference departments. Job descriptions and announcements began to include references to bibliographic instruction, and professional associations began to recognize it as a separate sub-field. ALA established first a Committee on Library Instruction and later the Library Instruction Task Force, while ACRL organized the Bibliographic Instruction Task Force and eventually the Bibliographic Instruction Section. A direct result of professional attention to bibliographic instruction was the development of ALA/ACRL guidelines in 1977.

Another achievement of the bibliographic instruction movement during the 1970s was the establishment of important, ongoing forums for the discussion of bibliographic instruction, including the annual Library Instruction Conference sponsored by Eastern Michigan University and the annual workshop sponsored by

Earlham College. Also developed at Eastern Michigan University were the Library Orientation Series, which continues to compile papers presented at the annual conference (reflecting though and trends in bibliographic instruction) and Project LOEX (or Library Orientation/Instruction Exchange), originally funded by the Council for Library Resources (Tucker 22). Since 1972, LOEX has been the national clearinghouse and central collection agency for library instruction information and sample materials (Kirkendall 22). In addition to providing this service, LOEX has produced interesting studies of current practices and trends and library instruction.

The first of these studies was published by Carolyn Kirkendall in Library Trends in 1980, providing the results of a survey of over 800 academic libraries and offering a description of bibliographic instruction practices during the 1970s. Kirkendall found that 24% of all respondents reported that bibliographic instruction in some form was required of students (generally in beginning English and communication courses) and that the most popular method of instruction was the lecture (with 95% reporting its use). Also popular were credit courses (42%), seminars and workshops (33%), and term paper clinics (21%). Only 2% of those surveyed in 1980 reported using Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI). Few libraries reported that formal evaluation was made of their bibliographic instruction programs, with 7% reporting testing and 52% reporting no evaluation at all.

Thirty-nine percent, however, reported that they were involved in orientation research (Kirkendall 55-56).

Seven years later, Mensching repeated the LOEX survey, again gathering over 800 responses. She found that the "number of institutions in which some form of BI or library-use competency was required rose significantly during the 1980s, from 24% in 1979 to 65% in 1987. She pointed out, however, that the term "'required BI' is wide-ranging in application and includes activities such as attendance at BI lectures, sessions, or tours, or course work such as workbook exercises" (Mensching 6-7). By 1987, the "most favored" means of providing library instruction was the course-related session or tour (at 65%), followed by course-related exercises (at 48%) (Mensching 9). Credit courses and term paper clinics declined somewhat in popularity in the 1980s (falling to 29% and 17%, respectively), while the use of the lecture remained popular (at 94%) and individualized instruction rose in popularity (to 95%) (Mensching 6-9). According to Mensching, there appears to be a "movement away from offering credit courses in library research skills" (Mensching 9).

Fjallbrandt and Malley report similar results in their analysis of U.S. academic library user education, indicating three main types of instruction: as a component of freshman English classes; subject-related instruction; and credit courses (178). They further report that the last ten years of library instruction is characterized by the use of audiovisuals and, more

recently, by the use of CAI and online instruction (which Mensching reported at 15%) (Fjallbrandt and Malley 181). They observe that user education in the U.S. occurs in three stages: orientation to a specific library and its services (usually in a college freshman's first week of classes); basic introduction to library and reference tools (usually in conjunction with freshman English classes); and advanced education in techniques and tools for specific subjects (usually offered to college juniors and seniors, including credit courses in some institutions) (Fjallbrandt and Malley 176).

Where, then, does bibliographic instruction stand in 1990? With libraries poised on the threshold of the electronic information age, Harold Shills points out that the "instructional mission of the academic library must be reassessed" (436). Although a few bibliographic instruction programs are beginning to address online databases, use of online catalogs, and CAI, there are other electronic information strategies and tools that must be addressed in bibliographic instruction programs. Shills cites access to consumer utilities, nonbibliographic databases marketed directly to professional end-users, electronic publishing, optical disks, and electronic document delivery as possibilities for inclusion in bibliographic instruction in the 1990s (Shills 436).

He summarizes the current state of bibliographic instruction in academic libraries as follows:

> Bibliographic instruction has emerged to enjoy widespread, though not universal, acceptance in academic libraries . . . . Using learning theories and additional knowledge from education, psychology, and other disciplines, instruction librarians have developed sophisticated user-education programs. Advancing beyond an earlier emphasis on library orientation and individual research tools, these new approaches focus on concepts such as information structure and research strategy and use innovative learning approaches . . . . Course-related and course-integrated instruction has displaced the library tour as the preferred form of presentation. (Shills 435-436)

THEORETICAL BASES OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

Shills' summary alludes to the next area to be covered in this presentation. The "how" of library instruction has already been discussed; now it's time to look more closely at trends in "what" is actually being included in the instructional process. To do that, some of the theories mentioned by Shills to be foundations of library instruction must be examined.

One way to consider theories that underlie library instruction is to adopt Cerise Oberman's view of "inside" and "outside" theories. She identifies "inside" theories as those that focus on the "very heart of librarianship--information and information structure" (Oberman 8). In fact, Jesse Shera advised librarians as far back as 1956 "not to pursue a teaching role" but rather to develop librarianship as a "discipline in its own right based on subject bibliography, the theories and techniques of documentation, [and] the investigation of how scholars and students make use of recorded knowledge" (Hopkins 195). Hopkins reflects that this approach is the "ideal" theoretical base for Justin Winsor's approach in the 1800s or linking practical

instruction in research technique to the 'method by which the subject is attacked' by scholars (Hopkins 195).

Although "inside" theories are addressed by a minority of library researchers, a notable exception is Michael Keresztesi, who examines scientific disciplines as "knowledge-producing and disseminating systems" (12), with bibliography an important dimension (23). The record of scholarship (i.e., bibliography), he proposes, is necessarily and inextricably related to research and the production of new knowledge; therefore, bibliography is a fundamental part of the research process. Keresztesi maintains that research occurs embedded in bibliography, which is a many-tiered system of linkages in which each productive and supportive action engenders corresponding effects in the discipline's literature and the information mechanism which provides access to it" (13). Bibliography, from this viewpoint, is "[i]n a sweeping sense . . . knowledge about knowledge, a metascience with a specific mission" (Keresztesi 24). In terms of library instruction, then, "inside" theories represent a focus on "the internal logic of the physical organization of the library" and its resources (Keresztesi 3).

An example of how "inside" theories may be applied to library instruction can be found in the views of Smalley and Plum, whose programs focus on the "distinguishing features and structural differences" of the literatures of the humanities and the sciences. In an upper level credit course on library research in the humanities, for example, they provide a series of

classes tailored to the scholarly research process in the humanities. After an introductory class, students complete two worksheet assignments that examine alternative ways of identifying books on a given topic; emphasis is on the many approaches to primary sources and on the advantages and disadvantages of each. Then, working through a series of lectures and worksheets, students examine selective bibliographies to locate background information, the card catalog as an access tool, the scholarly article and indexes, and a literary work in its historical context (via handbooks, biographical works, and major histories). Finally, they compile an annotated bibliography as an important teaching device that emphasizes the structure of the literature of a given subject area.

Oberman defines "outside" theories as those that come from "beyond the immediate scope of traditional librarianship," generally referring to those drawn from education and psychology (9). She further indicates that "outside" theories, which tend to dominate the literature at the present, are used by bibliographic instruction librarians primarily to develop programs based on learning theories, and, more specifically, to focus programs on "educating" rather than "instructing" (Oberman 9-10).

The broad categories of learning theories that dominate education as well as library instruction literature are behavioral learning theory and cognitive learning theory.

Behavioral learning theory originates in the writings of Locke, Hume, Hobbs, and Mills (Aluri and Reichel 16). It includes the following fundamental assumptions: (1) all knowledge is derived from sensory experience; (2) all knowledge can be broken down into simple basic units; (3) ideas are formed by the association of experiences occurring closely together in time; and (4) the mind is a blank slate on which new experiences are recorded and stored (Aluri and Reichel 15). Behavioral theories were later heavily influenced by Watson and Skinner, who assumed that "learning has taken place when overt, observable change has taken place" in behavior (Aluri and Reichel 22-23). Learning, they proposed, occurs as a result of reinforcement of desirable behavior (Aluri and Reichel 17).

American education has been strongly influenced by behavioral learning theories. Many educational programs are based on behavioral objectives and many teaching strategies are based on the assumptions that learning material can be broken down into simpler units and that advancement to the next unit and/or grades provide the reinforcement needed for learning (Aluri and Reichel 17).

In terms of bibliographic instruction, the influence of behavioral learning theory can be seen in the model statement of objectives in ALA's Bibliographic Instruction Handbook and in current emphasis by accrediting agencies on behavioral objectives and outcomes assessment. Smalley and Plum point out that the behavioral approach is often taken in library instruction

programs that emphasize access tools and basic library skills (148; see also Feinberg and King for a rationale for short-term library instruction). The popularity of self-paced instruction or individualized instruction, the use of workbooks or worksheets, the use of pre- and post-testing, and the growth of CAI for library use all reflect the influence of behavioral learning theory on bibliographic instruction (Aluri and Reichel 21-22).

An overview of CAI for library use by Mitsuko Williams and Elisabeth Davis suggest that its popularity arises from the "student-centric" nature of the behavioral approach (173). CAI programs may involve drill and practice, tutorials, dialogue, gaming, simulation, and problem-solving, all based on behavioral learning theory and all involving student interaction and reinforcement (Williams and Davis 176). Williams and Davis cite a program at the University of Denver in which CAI is used to combine traditional library skills and online search techniques, illustrating the current trend toward using CAI in teaching online bibliographic retrieval strategies (183). While CAI for library use is lauded for its effectiveness with "various levels of skills, learning styles, and sophistication," it also has a number of drawbacks. For example, because of equipment and staff time involved in developing CAI programs, its is not generally considered to be cost-effective. Furthermore, most programs are "home-grown," often requiring expertise of faculty outside of the

library and lengthy delays for "de-bugging" (Williams and Davis 185).

While behavioral approaches to library instruction seem to dominate practice, cognitive approaches seem to dominate current literature on library instruction. Cognitive learning theory originates in the writings of Descartes, Leibnitz, and Kant (Aluri and Reichel 17) and was later influenced by Tolman, Lew, and Gestalt psychology (Hill 471). The basic assumption of cognitive learning theory is, in direct opposition to behavioral theory, that the mind has a primary cognitive structure that precedes experience (i.e., it is not tabula rasa); its primary function is abstraction (Aluri and Reichel 18). From this viewpoint, learning is best facilitated when: (1) the learner has an 'understanding' of the task to be learned; (2) the learner is aware of and understands relationships between parts and the whole; (3) the learner experiences Gestalt "insight," suddenly finding a solution based on understanding rather than simple trial and error; and (4) the learner can transfer learning from one situation to another whenever he or she sees similarities and relationships (Aluri and Reichel 18). To put it very simply, cognitive learning theory is basically a conceptual approach that emphasizes creative problem-solving (Hill 472).

Teaching from this viewpoint involves four techniques: (1) the learner is presented with the most general and inclusive ideas first; (2) the learner's attention is drawn specifically to connections between the new learning material and material

already known; (3) learning material is presented in a logical order in which new information builds upon previous information; and (4) the learner is introduced to new learning material only after the old is mastered (Aluri and Reichel 19).

Cognitive learning theory has also had an effect on American education, as evidenced in the changes that occurred in science education after Sputnik was launched by the former USSR in the 1950s. Instead of teaching simple, sometimes disconnected "facts," science teachers began to present a "few powerful principles which . . . explain a large number of phenomena" (Aluri and Reichel 19). The widespread use of the survey course, in which a broad, cohesive picture of the subject matter is presented to the student, also reflects the influence of cognitive learning theory (Aluri and Reichel 19).

In bibliographic instruction, the cognitive approach emphasizes broad, unifying concepts such as systematic literature searching, citation patterns, and primary and secondary sources (Aluri and Reichel 23). Methodology in this approach often involves the use or development of bibliographies (as in Smalley and Plum's approach), pathfinders, and essays written by students to explain why certain sources were selected (Aluri and Reichel 24-25).

Kobelski and Reichel point out that the cognitive approach provides the rationale for course-related or "point of need" instruction that is almost considered a "given" of bibliographic instruction (74). They propose that "[e]xplicit conceptual

frameworks will help make library instruction more meaningful and will provide an organized context for its assimilation and consolidation (Kobelski and Reichel 74). This viewpoint also reflects the role of reinforcement in cognitive theory: cognitive theorists believe that reinforcement affects not simply the performance of certain behavior but, instead, the decision to perform the learned response (Hill 473).

By way of illustration, Kobelski and Reichel suggest seven conceptual frameworks that can be used as a basis for bibliographic instruction:

(1) Type of reference tool--"meaningfully" grouped together by format and type of information;

(2) Systematic literature searching--search strategy;

(3) Form of publication--design of forms of publication;

(4) Primary/secondary sources--especially useful in teaching differences between literature of the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences;

(5) Publication sequence--following a research idea from the beginning through sequence of publication;

(6) Citation patterns--examination of scholarly research process (footnotes and references);

(7) Index structure--based on primary assumptions in index construction (Kobelski and Reichel 74-77).

While most of the literature on bibliographic instruction seems to call for an "all or none" choice between behavioral and cognitive approaches, the program at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) takes into account the changing needs of a student as he/she progresses through a college education. This

developmental approach recognizes that the student may require a variety of types of instruction at different stages in his/her development as a college student and independent learner.

The UTC program, based on the developmental theory of William Perry, acknowledges four stages of student development: dualism, multiplicity, relativism, and commitment (Mellon 79). In the dualism stage, the student sees the world in terms of right or wrong, expecting right or wrong answers to every question, and believing in the authority of the instructor. Consequently, a student in this stage of development has trouble understanding alternative search strategies, where many library resources offer "right" answers, and will benefit from "simple, straightforward" bibliographic instruction (Mellon 79-80). An example of bibliographic instruction at this stage is to teach basic library skills and use of specific tools to college freshmen.

In Perry's second stage, multiplicity, the student has begun to realize that life is more complex and that there are parts of the world about which nothing can be definitely known (i.e., more than one perspective is "legitimate") (Mellon 80). Bibliographic instruction for students in this stage of development, usually in advanced subject classes, includes more complex problem-solving strategies and the use of more advanced bibliographic tools; its goal is to produce the independent library user (Mellon 80).

In the third stage of development, relativism, the student realizes that there are few areas of absolute knowledge and that

evidence is required to support opinions and that information in one area may be applied to problems elsewhere. It is a stage of abstract reasoning, never attained, say many college instructors, by most undergraduates. Graduate students, however, are often at this stage and can benefit greatly from library instruction that includes complex retrieval concepts, evaluation of bibliographic tools, and comparison of similarities and differences among libraries (Mellon 80).

In the final stage, commitment, the student realizes the logical necessity to take a position and make a choice. At this point, library instruction emphasizes alternative research strategies and the selection of relevant and appropriate resources (Mellon 81).

While the developmental approach is cogent, there is a problem, identified by Fatzer, as "lack of coherence between levels" (435). Because there is poor (if any) articulation between grade school and high school and high school and college, basic tools and concepts "must be taught again and again at successive levels, even to college students, as it cannot reliably be expected to have been previously taught at all" (Fatzer 435).

Consequently, an academic library instruction program must be designed, if adopting the developmental approach, to educate the student in both basic skills and tools as well as in strategies and concepts. The issue may be not so much what or how but <u>when</u> to offer library instruction and to what <u>degree</u>.

THE LIBRARY-CLASSROOM LINK[1]

Looking back over the current trends in academic library instruction, we see one common thread, regardless of the approach taken. We see that each approach--whether "inside," "outside," behavioral, cognitive, or developmental--is by necessity embedded in the subject field. This means that library instruction is inextricably linked to the classroom and that, as instruction librarians, we must cooperate with other teaching faculty to develop library instruction programs that are meaningful to students. Let us consider, then, some ways in which we as librarians can strengthen that library-classroom link.

First, we must seek recognition by faculty and students that the library is indeed a part of the instructional program--an important component of the educational process for each student. This is not an easy task, because there are unreceptive faculty and there are certainly unreceptive students. But it is something we
must do if we are to contribute in a meaningful way to a student's education.

One way that librarians can do this it by having the same commitment to instruction as other faculty. We can make sure that librarians are involved in college-wide curriculum development and in the design of new courses. We can make sure that our library instruction programs meet the same criteria as

---

[1]For a similar discussion, see "Library Instruction Is Not a Spectator Sport," by Deborah Grimes.

other classes, complete with written objectives, means of evaluation, and research. We can see that our library instruction programs receive budgetary attention, and, therefore, legitimacy within the overall educational process.

Secondly, librarians can strengthen the library-classroom link by extending the library into the classroom and vice versa. Library instruction sessions taught in the classroom indicate to students that the subject matter is as important as other information they gain in the classroom. It shows students that librarians do function outside of the library, and that we do more than check out books all day (Robbins 385). Furthermore, it eliminates the distractions that are unavoidable if the only opportunity we have to talk with students is in the middle of the library.

Moving library instruction sessions into the classroom shows faculty that we librarians are knowledgeable in our own subject matter and that we are using the same instructional techniques that they use. It establishes a situation in which the librarian can involve faculty in the library instruction discussion and in which the librarian can call on the instructor to provide reinforcement for an important point or clarification of an assignment. Faculty can often give practical examples of how library resources should be used in student assignments.

Since "students [tend] to perceive relevance directly from faculty," librarians can provide reinforcement for learning or motivation (depending upon the theoretical approach taken) for

library assignments by linking them to class assignments, such as opinion papers, speeches, or research papers (Bodi 59). This is where students get the all-important "point-of-need" motivation needed for successful library instruction.

On the other hand, the classroom can also be extended to the library, giving students time to complete library assignments related to classwork during their class periods. This gives them the benefit of both instructor and librarian, working hand in hand to help students learn how to locate and use information. And it shows the instructor how a librarian functions in the one-on-one teaching situation.

Now, 'lest I be accused of naivety, I must admit that instructors are not always willing to remain in the classroom, much less to join the class in the library. I, too, have served, unhappily and unwillingly, as a "baby-sitter" when stuck with a class because an instructor had something better to do one day. However, as Robbins says, "[h]ow we related to our teaching colleagues may be the key to successful integration of the library into the . . . curriculum" (384).

In many cases, librarians must cultivate a different relationship with teaching faculty, showing them that we are serious ourselves about the teaching role of the librarian and that we are serious educators. We must take the initiative in working with faculty not only to develop assignments that involve library resources but classroom sessions that involve library instruction. In doing so, librarians must recognize that

teaching faculty, like many students, have poor library or research skills themselves and may suffer from "library anxiety" (Mellon 163). Constance Mellon, who has developed a grounded theory of library anxiety, suggests that increased interaction between students and librarians can be used to allay student anxieties about library use--and the same approach can be taken with faculty (Mellon 164).

Finally, we must admit that librarians are poorly prepared for classroom instruction. Library schools do not prepare us to be teachers and we tend to be generalists instead of subject specialists like other faculty. Consequently, we must ask for help from other faculty, frankly admitting that we are new to the teaching arena and that we need guidance. This is where librarians can develop cooperative library instruction programs, asking for suggestions from teaching faculty about what topics should be taught by the instruction librarian. At the same time, librarians must view this as a collaborative effort, adding, from experience, the skills and concepts that we know that students will need to know. This is especially crucial during the evolution of library instruction programs, as we move from providing simple orientation to teaching basic skills to educating the student in more advanced concepts.

By focusing on the library-classroom link, we are connected to other librarians and to library instruction from Emerson's "professor of books" to scholar-librarians like Justin Winsor, Azariah Root, and Edwin Woodruff of the 1800s to the library-

college movement of the 1940s to Patricia Knapp and the Monteith College Library Experiment of the 1960s to the ever-growing number of our colleagues involved in bibliographic instruction today. As Cerise Oberman says, bibliographic instruction as a subspeciality of librarianship will "distinguish itself further"--and we can distinguish ourselves as librarians and faculty members by advocating and building strong linkages between the classroom and the academic library.

REFERENCES

Aluri, Rao and Mary Reichel. "Learning Theories and Bibliographic Instruction." Kirkendall, Bibliographic Instruction and the Learning Process 1-13.

Bodi, Sonia. "Relevance in Library Instruction: The Pursuit." College & Research Libraries 45 (January 1984): 59-65.

Brievik, Patricia S. Open Admissions and the Academic Library. Chicago: ALA, 1977.

Fatzer, Jill B. "Library Literacy." RQ 26 (Summer 1987): 435-436.

Feinberg, Richard and Christine King. "Short-Term Library Skills Competency: Arguing for the Achievable." College & Research Libraries 5 (June 1989): 41-42.

Grimes, Deborah. "Library Instruction Is Not a Spectator Sport!" School Library Media Activities Monthly 5 (June 1989).

Hill, Wilfred F. "Learning Theory." The Encyclopedia of Education. Ed. Lee C. Deighton. 10 vols. NY: Macmillan, 1971.

Hopkins, Frances L. "A Century of Bibliographic Instruction: The Historical Claim to Professional and Academic Legitimacy." College & Research Libraries 43 (May 1982): 192-198.

Kirkendall, Carolyn A. "Library Use Education: Current Practices and Trends." Library Trends 29 (Summer 1980): 29-37.

-----. Bibliographic Instruction and the Learning Process: Theory, Style, and Motivation. Ann Arbor, MI: Pierian, 1984.

Keresztesi, Michael. "The Science of Bibliography: Theoretical Implications for Bibliographic Instruction." Oberman and Strauch 1-26.

Kobelski, Pamela and Mary Reichel. "Conceptual Frameworks for Bibliographic Instruction." Journal of Academic Librarianship 7 (May 1981): 73-77.

Kohl, David F. and Lizabeth A. Wilson. "Effectiveness of Course-Integrated Bibliographic Instruction in Improving Coursework." RQ 27 (Winter 1986): 206-211.

Mellon, Constance. "Information Problem-Solving: A Developmental Approach to Library Instruction." Oberman and Strauch 75-89.

-----. "Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and Its Development." College & Research Libraries 47 (March 1986): 160-165.

Mensching, Teresa B. "Trends in Bibliographic Instruction in the 1980s: A Comparison of Data from Two Surveys." Research Strategies 7 (Winter 1989): 4-13.

Oberman, Cerise. "Why Theory? Or the End of Bibliographic Instruction." Kirkendall, Bibliographic Instruction and the Learning Process 1-13.

----- and Katina Strauch. Theories of Bibliographic Education. NY: Bowker, 1982.

Robbins, Wendy H. "Library Instruction: A Partnership Between Teacher and Librarian." Catholic Library World 55 (April 1984): 384-387.

Shills, Harold B. "Bibliographic Instruction: Planning for the Electronic Environment." College & Research Libraries 48 (September 1987): 433-453.

Smalley, Topsey N. and Stephen H. Plum. "Teaching Library Researching in the Humanities and the Sciences: A Conceptual Approach." Oberman and Strauch 135-170.

Stoan, Stephen K. "Research and Library Skills: An Analysis and Interpretation." College & Research Libraries 45 (March 1984): 99-109.

Tucker, John Mark. "User Education in Academic Libraries: A Century in Retrospect." Library Trends 29 (Summer 1980): 9-27.

Williams, Mitsuko and Elisabeth B. Davis. "Computer-Assisted Instruction: An Overview." Oberman and Strauch 171-192.

LOEX Clearinghouse (or National BI Database)
c/o Teresa Mensching, Director
University Library
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI 48197